<div align="center">**REMARKS**</div>

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1-13, 15, and 16 are pending in the present application. With this response, the Applicant amends claims 1 and 15 to clarify the claimed subject matter. All amendments are made without prejudice.

Double Patenting

In the Office Action, the Examiner issues an obvious-type double patenting rejection against claims 1-13, 15, and 16 as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent application 10/810,348. While the Examiner does not state in the Office Action whether this rejection is actual or provisional, it is taken as being provisional under MPEP 804(I)(B) because it is a double patenting rejection against two co-pending applications. Since this is a provisional double patenting rejection, the Applicant respectfully defers addressing the rejection until one of the applications is, with exception of addressing the double patenting rejection, in condition for acceptance (i.e. all other rejections and objections have been addressed to the Examiner's satisfaction).

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102(e)

Claims 1-13, 15, and 16

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-13, 15, and 16 as being anticipated by U.S. 6,430,561 to Austel et al. (hereafter "Austel").

Claims 1 and 15 recites *"one or more logically protected computing environments, each logically protected computing environment being an operating system compartment associated with at least one service or process supported by said system."* Claims 2-13 and 16 inherit this limitation by virtue of their dependence on either claim 1 or 15, either directly or indirectly.

The Applicant submits that the above limitation is not present in Austel. Austel does not use *"logically protected computing environment(s)"* (i.e. compartments) to control access to files. Austel uses access class checking to control access to files (*see* Austel, col. 6, line 24 to col. 7,

<div align="center">5</div>

line 25). Operating system compartmentalization is not mentioned in Austel at all. Therefore, Austel does not teach or suggest the use of a "*logically protected computing environment being an operating system compartment associated with at least one service or process supported by said system.*" The Applicant respectfully requests that the anticipation rejection against the claims be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 08-2025. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 08-2025.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transferred to the USPTO via EFS on

_____October 20, 2008_____
(Date of Transmission)

_____Joanna Sosa_____
(Name of Person Transmitting)

_____/Joanna Sosa/_____
Signature

_____October 20, 2008_____
Date

Respectfully submitted,

__/Brian J. Cash 60,546/_____
Brian J. Cash
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 60,546
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2100
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 fax
bcash@la.ladas.com